

498
71
A

L E T T E R
T O
JAMES TOBIN, ESQ.

LATE MEMBER OF
HIS MAJESTY'S COUNCIL
IN THE
ISLAND OF NEVIS.

FROM
JAMES RAMSAY, A.M.
VICAR OF TESTON.

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by JAMES PHILLIPS, George-Yard,
Lombard-Street. 1787.

8367.30

SA 1175.14.7

Rec^d May 1. 1845

*

Bought with the Bequest of Mr
Hon Wm Prescott, of Butler

1304
114

Tract 695

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following letter was prepared immediately on the publication of Mr. Tobin's Rejoinder; but its appearance was postponed in consequence of the reasoning that follows. It was observed to me, that Mr. Tobin, by acknowledging, in unqualified terms, the truth of Capt. Smith's letter, which was written to confirm all my observations on the oppressed state of the negroes in the sugar colonies, had fully and indisputably established against himself, every assertion in my original Essay, which affected the cause of slavery. Farther, he had himself in plain terms given up the cause as untenable. In the Cursory Remarks claimed by him, he hopes the blessings of freedom will be equally diffused over the whole face of the globe. He approves of the police and privileges, which the Essay proposes for improving the condition of slaves. In his Rejoinder, he is hurt at being supposed the champion of slavery, or of the oppression of slave-holders. He declares himself an enemy to negroe slavery, and to the unnatural traffick in them. He admits planters to have abused their power, and Guinea captains to have been guilty of barbarity. He acknowledges W. Indian slavery to be a gigantic mass of deformity, which wants to be taken down. He allows negroes to be capable of religious instruction. "What more it was said, does your Essay contend for? Mr. Tobin argues entirely on your side. It is true his Rejoinder is illiberal, virulent, and full of personal abuse. But even in the opinion of his friends

the M. Reviewers, you have fully vindicated yourself from every charge; and the wanton attack made on you, both by publick slander and private insinuation, has enabled you to bring forward to your friends such full and particular testimony of the innocency of your character, in every point contested with you, and of your candour in the execution of your Essay, as it is impossible for the power of prejudice or malice to effect. You may rest things on their present footing. Good sense must at length prevail; and your clients the injured Africans will be redressed." Against this I contended, that Mr. Tobin comes out against a poor vicar in the respectable character of one of his Majesty's privy counsellors. He, in his Rejoinder, claims to have his account of W. Indian slavery preferred; because, as he says, he had better opportunities than I of knowing it. He pretends to answer my contradictions of the Cursory Remarks, of which, whether justly or not, he assumes the composition. Under the guise of vindicating the present state of slavery, almost in every page, he insidiously turns the dispute into a virulent personal attack, not hesitating to stake his character for the truth of every falsehood alledged in the St. Kitt's libel against me; with a view, by casting an odium on me, of getting my book and reasoning included in the censure. I am not only to sit silent under the basest imputations, but I am to leave him in full possession of the field, exulting for his imaginary victory on the side of oppression. Would people read and com-
pare

pare my reasoning with that of my adversaries, I should freely leave matters as they are. But Mr. Tobin's Rejoinder is calculated for readers who wish to be persuaded into the belief, that nothing is necessary, or can be done for the relief of oppressed slaves. By all my accounts from the W. Indies, my Essay has already had the happiest effects, in rendering insensibly the treatment of slaves less oppressive. But such is the natural indolence of man, so easily is he flattered into what favours sloth, or pretends to be for his interest, that if I allow Mr. Tobin uncontradicted to tell them, that they have all along behaved irreprehensibly to their slaves, and that it is not necessary or not possible to improve their condition, they will readily believe him, and be more apt to resume their former unfeeling behaviour, than to increase their present attention towards them. Concerning what those who know me think of me, I am quite easy. My life will be my best vindication. My reputation among my adversaries, I make no account of. I know they think better of me, than their malice will permit them to acknowledge. Respecting the world in general, I am not quite so indifferent; though the vindication of it alone would hardly induce me to appear in print. But my character assumes an importance when connected with the cause of liberty, which I have undertaken. The publick will excuse a solicitude about it, when it has been inseparately blended with the merits of an object, that ought to interest every human feeling, that calls loudly

loudly for the careful investigation and correction of the legislature. I am however willing to wait, till I see whether the M. Reviewers, by the account they give of Mr. Tobin's Rejoinder, call on me for an answer. I mention them particularly, because they have taken a decided part against me, and their opinion carries weight with various people.

In the August Review, this opinion has been given. Mr. Tobin is declared "to have animadverted on my Reply, in a very able manner, in animated language, though not filled with those sarcastick retorts, and invective expressions, which they had observed and censured in my Reply." This is preceded in the same paragraph by a positive censure of the general acrimony of my publications. It is a pity that these Reviewers did not put the same author's different publications into the same hands to be reported on, for preserving uniformity in their decisions. The man, who reviewed my original Essay, and my inquiry into the African trade, was a violent friend of liberty, and he censured me severely for my lukewarm manner of treating so animating a subject. Now, it seems in some other hands of the same body, my publications, these not excepted, are become acrimonious. As far as this respects my later publications, I had a right to expect a little lenity from them, because the excess might be ascribed to my attention to or misapprehension of their original censure. But may I not, without offending against the spirit of meekness, observe, that the same Review which first censured me for acrimony, censured

fured the acrimony and personalities of the
 Cursory Remarks claimed by Mr. Tobin, and
 for these having led the way in acrimony.
 When their hand was in, why did they not
 observe these defects in them, as well as in
 my Reply, especially since these Remarks by
 their own confession struck the first blow?
 By this omission, Mr. Tobin and I are not
 placed on an equal footing, and I find myself
 obliged once more to come before the pub-
 lick, to tell my own tale, or rather as Mr.
 Tobin contrives it, that of my poor clients,
 the negroe slaves. But I trust that the cause is
 here brought to such an issue, as to admit of
 no further argument on Mr. Tobin's side.
 That lie, which he has so genteely given me
 concerning the ringing of the plantation bell
 at four o'clock in the morning, is the only
 answer left him to make. Let him once use
 that roundly, and he shall have the last word.

I shall embrace this opportunity of repeat-
 ing my call on government, to inquire how
 far any possible profit to those concerned in
 the African slave trade, is a sufficient reason
 for our bending the whole force of that branch
 of commerce to the improvement of the
 French sugar colony on Hispaniola; which
 is to them an immense fund of trade, and a
 most numerous nursery for their navy; to
 which we have nothing to set in opposition,
 except the northern fisheries, which are left
 to languish under the feeble exertions of
 voluntary contributions.

September 12th, 1787.

P. S. I have just perused in the *Monthly Review* of October a Criticism on the *W. Indian Eclogues*, lately published. The Reviewers say, "they have every reason to believe that writers have greatly exaggerated in their accounts of the cruelties exercised towards the negroes." As my writings make a considerable part of the publications on the subject, I should have considered myself as interested in this charge, had not the same gentlemen in their Reviews of July 1784 and June 1785, acquitted me by name. I now take this opportunity of positively declaring, that every publication on the subject of slavery that has come to my knowledge is greatly within the truth; and in particular that the *W. Indian Eclogues* are in no circumstances an exaggerated account of what in my time might frequently have been seen by any man of any observation. I am sorry to find that persons, who have so much influence on the public taste and judgment, should have attempted, as in this Review is done, to vindicate oppression and cruelty of the most horrid nature by a "kind of political necessity." I trust such scenes will shortly be laid before the public, as will force them to retract an opinion that can be formed only from partial and interested representations.

E R R A T A.

P. 4. l. 20. for T. Tobin, read J. Tobin.

P. 6. l. 1. dele if such you be.

P. 11. l. 18. for reading, read perused.

P. 21. l. 24. for instances, read instruments.

P. 22. l. 18. dele not.

P. 38. In speaking of the mildness of Mexican slavery, the author throws out the circumstance of their human sacrifices; which were quite distinct, and had no reference to slavery, except when connected with guilt,

T O
JAMES TOBIN, Esq.

LATE MEMBER OF HIS MAJESTY'S COUN-
CIL IN THE ISLAND OF NEVIS.

S I R,

I OBSERVE this name prefixed to a pamphlet, called, "A short Rejoinder to the Reverend Mr. Ramsay's Reply;" to him who has assumed this name is this answer to that Rejoinder addressed. The propriety of your publication rests on the notice which the Reply takes of a pamphlet, called *Cursory Remarks on my Essay on Slavery*. From the long pause on the side of any antagonist, whom my friends thought worthy of an answer, I began to hope, that, as the management had got into better hands, the contest, as far as respected me, was determined. Every virulent expression, concerning me and my writings, had been exhausted; every circumstance of my life had been maliciously sifted and exposed, not as things were, but as my enemies wished to find them. My defence had been approved of. It had even forced a favourable verdict from the *Monthly Review*, in that very number (January 1786) wherein they had thought proper to join in the harsh censure of my adversaries. I mention this Review, and shall frequently appeal to it, as being, in your opinion, "a valuable periodical publication;" to whose decision my enemies cannot object; for it has in

A

few

few respects been indulgent to my writings, and of late not very partial to my cause. All was before the public, and I was bound by its award.

I have therefore some cause of chagrin, in being obliged to go over the same ground with you, a new opponent, with whom I have no connection; who yet have contrived so to blend your reputation and writings with those of an anonymous libeller, as renders it difficult to do myself justice, and also respect your rank and assumed character. Of the author of the C. Remarks, I firmly persevere in my first opinion. And if truth were capable of addition, this opinion has been strengthened by the apology which he, depending on the loose morality of the present age, has put into the mouths of his friends, to be used in his vindication. Of James Tobin, Esq. late member of His Majesty's Council, I wish I could think well. So much am I inclined to respect the royal mandamus, that it will give me pain to be obliged, in my own defence, to bear hard on one whom the king delighted to honour. In any case, I shall be careful not to go out of the work before me.

You are pleased to assume the credit of the C. Remarks. My conjecture concerning them was, that the hints had been given to some hireling, who had dressed them up for the public. Before the publication of this Rejoinder, I did not think so unfavourably of mankind, as to suppose that a man could be found, who, having a reputation to support, with acquaintances of any possible character, would venture to put his name to the many unfounded assertions contained in that pamphlet; far less that, like a mountebank's zany coming in to confirm his master's boasting, he would, with the author of the C. Remarks (see Rejoinder, pag. 91.) repeat and make himself answerable for all the contradictory contents of the St. Kitt's libel.

A man,

A man writing in a fictitious name, from loose general hints, has no respect to modesty, he is by any means to earn his wages, and frame a taking story. It was therefore charity in me to suppose this of my unknown antagonist, rather than hold him up as a falsifier of facts for the purposes of detraction and oppression. Nor, though you affirm p. 11. that "not one of *the most intimate* of your friends ever read a page of the C. Remarks till they were printed," unless the real author's friends have sadly belied him, do I yet believe myself much out in my conjectures of the manner wherein they were given to the publick.

My information says, that when the true author of the C. Remarks first talked of appearing in print, his friend dissuaded him, but finding him obstinate, insisted that the work should pass through his hands for correction, which the story says it greatly needed. He, dying before the publication of the Rejoinder, left it free for any one to claim the credit of his labours. But not to insist on this (though it be not lightly given to the public, and indeed comes better authenticated to me than any thing can that is brought to contradict it) there is a striking difference between the style of the C. Remarks and the Rejoinder. Of the first the M. Reviewers say, "it is not ill written." The second bears the mark of a different hand; is heavy, loose, abusive, the expressions low, the words ill chosen. Now while I continue to think thus of the C. Remarks, I have no mistake to acknowledge in the manner in which I have mentioned them.

With the family of the Tobins I have little acquaintance. I was once in company with a ship-master of Nevis of that name, who had a son, a modern fine gentleman, as I was told, then in England. The first that came forward in this business was an J. Tobin, who, by a very extraor-

dinary indulgence, was permitted to throw down his gauntlet in the M. Review (Jan. 1786.) and there claim the C. Remarks. But this claim he could not make good; not only for the reasons already assigned, but because, in that Review, he denies his having made a personal attack on me, while the same Review censures these C. Remarks (page 30) for the asperities and personalities of their language. So, here was Reviewer Tobin against Reviewer. The same Reviewers also observe, that J. Tobin, in the unedited part of his letter, (I suppose) strongly denies, in the most explicit terms, his being the apologist for Negro Slavery, (p. 32.) But the C. Remarks are a professed apology for slavery, an attempt to prove, that slaves are fit only for their present state, which is preferable to that of English peasants. See C. Remarks, p. 85, &c. and M. Review, Oct. 1785.

About the same time, two threatening letters came to my hand signed by another **T**Tobin: I say another, because I cannot conceive how he, who had once committed his cause to the public, and meant to parade as a Reviewer in all the divine panoply of conscious innocency, could think of calling a man out, who must have been lost to all sense of propriety, and every principle of his profession, in such circumstances to have met a bravo. If my courage must be ascertained, I have served my country at sea usefully nine years. I have been in several actions. I have often been in danger. I have gone into danger, because I thought my duty required it, when I might have avoided it without censure. It was not on this, and on no other account could it be, necessary for me to meet one who seemed desirous of getting himself hanged for murder, because he was pleased to imagine himself hurt in the person of an anonymous libeller, and felt himself sore.

I have

I have heard that the son of the above ship-master had in his youth been placed with an attorney in England. About 1760 or 1761, he came out on a visit to Nevis; but I believe soon returned to England. On the death of his father, about 1768 or 1769, he made another short visit to Nevis. About 1779, he came out a third time, and remained about two or three years. Perhaps this may probably be you, who design yourself Esquire, and late member of his Majesty's council for that island. But of this I am doubtful; for he, I believe, was a native of Nevis, and you talk only of a residence there of some years, which it is not likely you should do, had you had the happiness to be born a Creole; a character which you affect to honour, and therefore, on a fair occasion, would not suppress. These contradictions, and this mysterious management, leave me free to imagine what is least dishonourable to the species of which I am partaker. And agreeably to this freedom, I shall consider the anonymous author of the C. Remarks, the Reviewer J. Tobin, the Duellist ~~J.~~ Tobin, the son of the above ship-master, and James Tobin, Esquire, late member of his Majesty's council, each as a distinct person. Should all these characters meet in one person, they form such an individual, as I desire to know nothing more of.

You set out, (p. 1.) with affirming that the Reply abuses the author of the C. Remarks. For argument's sake allow it. The M. Reviewers, (January 1786) in censuring the asperities and personalities of his language, acknowledge that he gave the first hurt. But when a yelping cur attacks you in the highway, and attempts to bite your heel, do you run away from him, or do you pull your hat off, and say, Sweet Mr. Dog, trouble me not; or do you lend him a good hearty blow with a stick, or a stone. You, if you be the author of these Re-

marks, ~~if such you be~~, acknowledge that you hardly know me; and yet you stake your credit for the truth of a thousand infamous falsehoods respecting me. If you really be the author of these remarks, come boldly forward, humble yourself under the censure of your friends the M. Reviewers, and make a manly apology, and if you can prove I have made a false charge against you, I shall take care not to be behind you in good manners. But till you shall have done this, remember, you can have no claim on me for any acknowledgment or satisfaction for what you shall have been pleased to object against, in my management of a dispute with an anonymous libeller, or my subsequent treatment of you, placing yourself in his room.

This charge of abuse is repeated in the C. Remarks, almost in every page, in the lowest and most abusive terms. Page 1, 2, 3, talk of "rash assertions, gross misrepresentations, virulent invectives, illiberal, unchristian manner, fallacies, injurious, ill-founded assertions, palpable and numerous contradictions. Page 4, acrimonious misrepresentation, intemperate or offended self-sufficiency. Page 6, ebullitions of his philanthropy. Page 23, unaccountable illiberality. Page 33, detestable caricature. Page 34, unjust, ungenerous sarcasms, reverend satyrist. Page 47, a dash of white-wash, and load of blacking-ball; twenty broken heads, and one plaster. Page 102, Apostate, Presbyterian parson, metamorphosed surgeon. Page 142, vehement innovator, negro Calvin, fable Knox. Page 143, arrogance of style. Page 146, petulance. Page 148, rancorous acrimony," &c. &c. are the usual terms which this anonymous libel applied to me, before I could have known that I had given offence.

Now, in confirmation of the justice of all these illiberal expressions poured out on me, these C. Remarks

Remarks condescend on one, and only on one instance of abuse in my Essay; for they give up the profligate clergyman, and quote him, p. 104, on their own side for a particular purpose. I shall place together this original fault of my Essay, and the C. Remark hazarded on it, and leave it to a man of your sense and breeding, to determine how far they tally. My Essay, page 93, says, "I have now in contemplation before me, a planter, who conceives himself to be a conscientious man, who, till lately, gave his negroes only six herrings a week, and those not very regularly supplied." Observe the C. Remark on this, p. 83. "Here the author resumes the darkest of his colours, to exhibit the most odious and contemptible portrait of an unfortunate individual, whose ample fortune, it appears, served no better purpose than to render his unworthiness more conspicuous. The supposed original of this caricature is also, I am informed, gone to his account. Mr. Ramsay might therefore, with propriety, have spared this inhuman sketch: but he seems like the famous Spagnolet," (a simile from Aiken's Miscellanies) "to delight chiefly in pictures, which excite disgust and horror, and like him, therefore, fond of drawing from dead subjects." From this specimen may be judged the sort and degree of provocation, which my Essay has given to planters. I leave it to candour to say, whether even St. Paul's description of charity may not be made a libel by the like management. And can I suppose a privy counsellor to have used this bloated language, or to have employed himself in digging up from the grave a rotten carcase, merely to tell the publick that he had read Aiken's Miscellanies?

If then words have a meaning, the author of the C. Remarks dealt in personalities, and filled his pamphlet with abuse; and to establish the provo-

cation, on which he proceeded, he fixes only on one instance of abuse, which yet is no abuse, but a simple matter of fact, of the knowledge of which my situation made me perfectly competent. Hence I have a right to affirm, that my Essay was neither abusive or personal. And further, I give authority which you will not dispute, the M. Review (July 1784, June 1785,) which repeatedly censured it for its lukewarm manner of treating such a subject. The C. Remarks, and St. Kitt's Libel (see M. Review, Jan. 1786) first introduced personalities, by making my private character answerable for my reasoning. When they had established this into a maxim, and thereby *staked the truth of their own cause on the perfect innocence of their own personal characters*, I found myself obliged, it became part of my argument, to strip my adversaries of their borrowed plumes, degrade them from the censor's chair, and expose them in their true colours; for if I proved them corrupt, on their own principles, I proved their cause rotten. And I have the satisfaction to reflect, that no man, who knows the parties, thinks that I have advanced a false thing, or in such circumstances as they had placed me, said a word too much respecting them. The wonder is, how I could restrain my indignation at their illiberal treatment, and use my knowledge of their real characters with so much moderation.

In your Rejoinder, p. 5, you accuse me of quoting the C. Remarks falsely. Yet you requote the passages, without correcting one, except where, for brevity's sake, I had explained a seven years servitude of vagabonds, by the phrase making "vagabonds useful." Of this you are free to make the most you can.

Your Rejoinder repeats this charge of abuse against me, and yet every page of it is filled with the lowest and most illiberal terms. P. 1, "warm
irritable

irritable antagonist. P. 2, ill-conducted, vindictive attack. P. 3, 4, coarse and uncouth daubing, wonted candour and consistency. P. 5, mutilated scraps. P. 7, rancorous prejudice, hack and hew without mercy. P. 15, cruel and unforgiving spirit. P. 16, ungracious assault. P. 18, uncommon inveteracy, disingenuous attempts. P. 19, intemperate ribaldry. P. 53, virulent antagonist. P. 54. Virulence and prejudice. P. 91, battery of blunderbuffs. P. 92, petulant cavils, &c. P. 93, intemperate, unbecoming dialect. P. 98, relentless spirit, are but a few of the phrases respecting me and my writings, with which your pamphlet abounds. And they flow in so easy a manner as might induce persons, not acquainted with the amiable character which you voluntarily give yourself, p. 96, to imagine them to be your natural language. Should I do any injury to the accomplished man, who is there exhibited, by supposing (as in the case of the author of the C. Remarks,) some friend or hireling, in the dark, to have done this dirty work for you? Or are these indeed the most elegant and mild terms which your humane feelings (p. 92,) could permit you to use? May not such feelings allow of much licentiousness, both in speaking and acting? As your friends call these terms "animated language, in a very able manner, without sarcastic retorts, and invective expressions," they will doubtless explain for the benefit of the publick, what constitutes sarcasm and invective. It cannot surely be the honest indignation of innocence, when she finds herself unluckily dragged into a dispute, in the cause of virtue, and has to repel every illiberal false accusation, that interested impudence can feign against her.

In p. 7. 52. 63, 64, &c. you insist on the credit due to your testimony from your acquaintance with plantation affairs, the probability of your knowing
more

more than I respecting them, and your having had the direction of near 1000 slaves of your own and your friends. You say your residence was in Nevis. Now though there be worthy men and humane planters in that colony, in my time, taking it generally, it was an unpromising place, wherein to search for much good treatment or methodical management. It is a poor dry worn out soil; and two-thirds of the planters consist of those involved poor settlers, whom the C. Remarks charges with pinching and ill-treating their slaves. But if you be the son of the above Mr. Tobin, in your short desultory visits, after you were grown up, you could have little opportunity, and being a fine gentleman you must have had but little inclination, to inform yourself of the economy of a plantation, before your last settlement, about 1779, which I imagine was not above two or three years before your removal to this country.

Now, you know it to be the custom for planters, residing in England, to give their acquaintances, who are going abroad, letters of attorney, to act on their plantations for them. And often so difficult is it to get persons to accept of these powers, that they are glad sometimes to make them in favour of any who will receive them. The manager waits on such attornies on their arrival; and a day is appointed for visiting and dining at the plantation. Every thing appears fair. The absent planter is informed that such and such supplies are wanting, or that all is in a promising way. The attorney assumes the shipping of the sugar, dines once a year with the manager, and signs his accounts. This is the progress of such a desultory attorney, as you must have been, even in your last settlement abroad. But in my time not one in ten of them ever saw the inside of their friend or constituent's negro hospital. The real direction is left

left with the manager, or with attornies, who are skilful planters, and have a fixed abode in the colonies.

To set against this, I had for many years the care, at different times, of above 3000 slaves. I was daily among them to observe their treatment, and attend to their complaints. My situation enabled me to become particularly acquainted with the state of a full half of the plantations in St. Kitt's, and they were such as were managed in the most methodical manner; and I must have known, because I made it my business to inquire, whatever was remarkable in the management of any plantation in that colony, which contained then from 25,000 to 30,000 slaves.

I made also the tour of Nevis, and conversed on the subject with sensible men of that colony; one of whom reading my Essay in MS. in its uncastigated state, and neither did observation or information mark any thing particular. That there may be one or two plantations provided, as you assert, in necessary apartments for lying-in women, &c. is barely possible, (I know one in Nevis that comes near to it, except perhaps the lying-in apartments) but that, in July 1781, there was any number of well-supplied plantations in that island, (independent of the inconveniencies attending a state of war) sufficient to vindicate your general assertion, I positively deny.

You make exceedingly free with my representation of the state of slaves. In every page it is exaggerated, rancorous, virulent. Again, in p. 100, speaking of Capt. Smith's letter, you say, "it is sensibly written with manly candour;" and p. 101, "if every one who is properly qualified, would give his sentiments with the same impartiality, planters would have much less reason to complain of

of the many outrageous attacks which have been lately made upon them."

Now, that letter confirms whatever I have advanced concerning slaves. He says, p. 12, "The ill treatment of slaves is too well known, and too universal to be denied." P. 16, "He perfectly agrees with me in every part of my Essay." P. 19, he says, "it is astonishing that any man will presume to affirm, that the negroes are better treated than the peasantry in England." This you know is directly in the teeth of those C. Remarks, which you claim. In your account of this letter, p. 101, you say, "He confines his strictures chiefly to one character." He does not so, he gives one bad character as a sample of the rest, and says, "the ill treatment is too universal to be denied." Again, you observe from his account of a single humane planter, who treated his slaves in the French manner, that "we may conclude there are as many kind and indulgent proprietors, as there are cruel and oppressive ones," p. 101. Now p. 14, 15, he confines the humanity he observed, to those who followed the French custom in the French quarter; but says, elsewhere it was the same as in the other islands, unfeeling and cruel. Thus to put the change on your readers, by sinking a general observation into a particular instance, and again extending a particular instance into a general observation, will be accounted for in your next; as well as how that becomes candid and impartial, when affirmed by a military gentleman, which, from the pen of a clergyman, was rancorous, illiberal, exaggerated, and false.

You say, p. 8. "I have no where wilfully endeavoured to mislead my readers." We cannot account for the constitution of certain minds. To some crooked may appear straight, and straight crooked. Mr. Sheridan observes in his speech,
that

that a serpent cannot go straight forward. All his motions are wriggling and twisting. But reconsider the following instances, and you will allow that those readers must be misled, who take things in their obvious meaning. In my remarks on them, I shall return you the compliment you have paid me concerning the time of ringing the plantation bell in the morning, by supposing you acute enough to understand the meaning without my being obliged to use an unhandsome word.

1. You quote, p. 58, this passage from the Reply. "A barrel of American flour [weighs one hundred and ninety-six pounds, this] should be a week's allowance for thirty-seven negroes." You suppress the words between the hooks, which ascertain the weight, and then call the calculation obscure. You proceed to affirm, that on every estate, with which you were connected, there was a regular weekly allowance of six pints of grain or flour. Now the allowance of six pints is not disputed with you. It is in my original Essay. But he will be imposed on, who supposeth a W. Indian pint equal to an English pint; eight of which last weigh seven pounds. I wish not to mark individuals. I have carefully avoided it, till forced by their false friends in my own defence. But I could name a plantation, under the direction of the most exact person belonging to St. Kitt's, where 180 slaves had a weekly allowance of six pints, distributed out of two barrels. This is little more than two pounds to each. On estates in general, except where I have already made the distinction, this is the case, more or less in proportion, to the pinching accuracy of the overseer. This you will allow needs correction. Or to shew you how unwilling I am to bear hard on your veracity, I will suppose the quotation of the weight of the flour above to have been inadvertently dropped, and that notwithstanding

ing your having had the care of near 1000 slaves; you heeded the detail of plantation affairs so little, as not to have distinguished between a pound and a pint of grain or flour.

2dly. In answer to my correction of the surgeon's salary said in C. Remarks to be from £ 50 to £ 60 for every 100 slaves, you say, p. 62, "There was no attempt at imposition in your statement, as your readers must naturally conclude you meant the money of the country you were writing of." Certainly you have a right to explain yourself. But if you consider that in the C. Remarks, note p. 69, this £ 60 is compared with hospital salaries in England, you must acknowledge the mistake is not easily to be discovered, or allowed for. But I deny, that in my time, either at Nevis or St. Kitt's, there were salaries equal to £ 60 currency for 100 slaves. In few instances in St. Kitt's did they rise to £ 30 currency. In some they were as low as £ 10 currency. On few plantations was any allowance made for accidents; and where these were allowed for, they could not be equal to £ 6 currency per ann. P. 62, you go on to retort the imposition on me for acknowledging 3s. 4d. per head to be paid, when I had talked only of 14d. My Essay shall speak for itself. P. 82, "A surgeon's allowance per head varies from fourteen pence to three shillings; in some instances it rises to three shillings and six-pence." The whole of this article is managed in a manner, in which I can give you no assistance.

3dly. In answer to my correction of country livings, stated in C. Remarks at £ 300 sterling per ann. You say, p. 84, "It was hardly worth my while to prove so particularly a trifling difference of £ 50 or £ 60; and that you have still the same reasons to think that you are little out in your calculation, respecting the Island (Nevis) with which
you

you are best acquainted." By the by, £ 50 is not a trifling difference to a Welch curate, to whom these livings are proposed. Now, in my time, the salary in St. Kitt's, independent of a house, in no parish, except those which I held, exceeded £ 300 currency (about £ 180 sterling). In Nevis the nominal salary was in sugar, about a ninth part higher; and one particular parish there, had a glebe of considerable extent, but I believe not very profitable. Still those, who were best provided for in Nevis, would gladly have exchanged for a settlement in St. Kitt's. In Antigua the commutation salary was much less. Say then sterling was a slip of the pen for currency.

4thly. You say, p. 70. You had, in mind, repeated presentments against the indecency of working slaves on Sunday, which you had seen preferred in another island (Nevis) and were not dreaming of St. Kitt's. I marked the indecency as prevailing at a particular time at St. Kitt's; to it, therefore, I concluded your contradiction had been given. But persons acquainted with the police of Nevis, will be surprized to hear of these repeated presentments, and be apt to ask what was done in consequence of them. If they happened in my time, (though if they did, I cannot account for my not having heard it) it was probably during the short period wherein a worthy man, since lost to society, took the lead in such matters. This you will allow needs to be cleared up.

5thly. To the following appearance of misleading your readers, I know not how to give a name. It is so plain, that he must be supposed blind, who does not discover it. You agree, p. 70, with me, that a cask of sugar weighs 1200 lb. at the king's beam, and sells from 40 s. to 52 s. p. 100 lb. which is from £ 24 to £ 31 4s. per cask; yet you say it is imposition in me to affirm that sugar-bakers, who
pay

pay this price for the sugar, pay from £ 24 to £ 30 per cask, because the cask neats not to the planter above £ 10 or £ 12. In my Essay, the price paid by the sugar baker is mentioned, to shew the importance of the sugar colonies. But not a circumstance appears, which can lead a person to suppose that the planter's profit, or even his receipt is meant. I well know their part is small, and that the monopoly of the British market alone enables them to carry on the culture of the sugar cane, by the unprofitable high-priced labour of slaves. But I pray you reconcile how my premises may be granted, and my conclusion denied.

P. 97. You give what you call the drift of my inquiry into the African trade. I wish people to read the work itself, because I cannot stand to your report.

P. 11, 12. You accuse me of acrimonious and continued quarrels, and join with the C. Remarks in holding me up as the most abominable character, that ever was exposed to the abhorrence of the publick. I dare affirm, I never in one instance began a quarrel, and never prosecuted one further than self-defence made necessary. My quarrels arose out of the discharge of my duty as a clergyman, a neighbour, and a citizen, among a thoughtless people, broken by party, and ruled by faction. Independent of these circumstances, during a residence of 19 years, four different persons thought fit to express their displeasure at me. One of these was the Annotator in the St. Kitt's libel. Not finding food for his choler in my resentment, he gradually resumed, and was permitted, his former intimacy in my family. The three others, in their distress, in the very hour of their unprovoked ill-behaviour, made so little account of my rancour, as to solicit my friendship; and all three were essentially served by me. The consequence, at this day,

day, of one of these good offices, performed seventeen years ago, is the locking up from me upwards of £3000 sterling, which, but for a very unexpected circumstance, must have been for ever lost to my family. Such have been the effects of my rancorous temper.

P. 12. You exult at your having, at 4000 miles distance, thought and written like the African merchant and clergyman in the St. Kitt's libel. Again, p. 15, speaking of him and me, you say, "the two holy gladiators appear to be in many respects tolerably well matched." Your Rejoinder, and C. Remarks, are both full of sarcasms at clergymen. You cannot even restrain your spite here in the case of a volunteer combatant on your own side; and there are persons, to whom I hope the profession as such will ever be obnoxious. But in these two passages, your disgust to clergymen has made you forget the respect due to yourself. You affirm me to be a most vile man; the African merchant is my match; you write and think as he does. By the fairest figure in logic, you think and write like a vile man. It shall be left to the reader to determine, who is most like the African merchant whatever he may be; he who contradicts him in every position; or he who thinks and writes as he does. But is it not for the credit of the author of the C. Remarks, to suppose, as I have done, that he has copied from, rather than thought and written like, such a man?

P. 13. You censure me for introducing anonymous letters. Did I publish the names of men residing in the W. Indies, and deprecating the usual treatment of slaves, I should be the cause of their being torn in pieces. You find I am not quite safe from the danger of being assassinated by a hot-headed zealot for oppression even in England. But why, in much safer circumstances, with a powerful body of planters to huzza and protect you, do you

in p. 50 imitate the practice, by introducing an anonymous friend to contradict the general current of evidence, and even your own confession, p. 101, when speaking of Capt. Smith's letter, for the superior good treatment of French slaves? In this anonymous letter, a general conclusion is drawn from very meagre premises, the remarks of an individual. But when he says that French slaves are allowed time for provisions, he mentions a custom forbidden by the Code Noir. It is not generally true, that, according to him, French slaves know not the advantage of hogs. In my Essay there is an instance given to the contrary in Guadaloupe. It is not, as he says, necessary that they should be fed with musty island provisions. Their masters are obliged to allot them land for the growth of provisions, and farine is but one of the articles produced on it, and is easily preserved in a sound state. You yourself, p. 49. allow them "in general possibly to be rather (with what reluctance is this expressed) a little better clad" and to be more polished, or, as you word it, "to approach a small matter nearer to the grimace of civility" than English slaves. Now, have you not remarked that one advantage draws another after it? He who is starving for hunger, will not lay out his money for clothes. A master, who pinches the belly of his slave will hardly think of dressing him up neatly. A man will not think of being civil and attentive to those around him, till he be at peace with his own bowels, and has not the craving of hunger to divert his thoughts to himself.

P. 17. You say you cannot discover in the C. Remarks, those personal invectives, those bad names, and those other breaches of decorum, with which I say it so flagrantly abounds. The eye is said not to be capable of seeing itself. I think you may find a tolerable collection from that work
in

in the beginning of this letter. But it is a point that you may settle with the M. Reviewers, January 1786. for it is their charge against it.

P. 19. You reprimand me for my ostentatious title pages. I call myself Vicar of Teston; a living, which, after paying taxes and pensions charged on it, is worth about £50 per ann. Was not this charge thrown in to make weight? or was it a delicate way of reproving my presumption for thinking differently from an Esquire and Privy Counsellor? I beseech you to consider, that before the publication of the Rejoinder, I knew neither your names nor dignities.

P. 20. You name me foster father of Mr. Clarkson's work. I am proud of Mr. Clarkson's acquaintance. But, as you say of the St. Kitt's libel, his work was in the press before I knew his name. He is able to stand alone. He is now giving his time and attention to a work respecting slavery, that will do him credit with every man, who has a heart to feel for another's woe; and he will be able to bring forward such a body of proof, as must bear down prejudice and sophistry before it.

P. 24. You say, "neither the slavery of the W. India colonies, or the commerce of the human species, *are* to be defended, except on political grounds, and the general practice of the most enlightened nations." The C. Remarks say much the same. This is very well. But how agrees it with the assertions, p. 32, 33. 68, and frequently echoed in both works, of the happy state of slaves, and their being in a situation preferable to that of free peasants in England. It is true, p. 32, 33, even where you are repeating this bold assertion, you say I mistake, or wilfully endeavour to misrepresent, when I charge you with it. But you qualify the matter, only by suggesting, p. 68, the variety of plans now before the publick for the

benefit of the poor. Had I, as I have not, indiscriminately abused planters, as you boldly and indiscriminately have every man of condition in England, it seems I might have come off, by saying that numbers of every rank, sect, and party, are at present united in bringing something forward for the benefit of slaves.

Note, p. 24. You say, that I voluntarily became the proprietor of slaves, and sold them with the sang froid of a most obdurate planter; that probably I bound my slave out, p. 78, to a free negroe or mulatto tradesman in town, where he must be cruelly used. P. 75. That I thought not of advancing the situation of a single slave to enable them to profit by religious instruction. P. 77. That the thieves, whom I sold, most likely were purchased by masters, who could best reconcile their feelings to severe discipline.

An advocate for oppression cannot frame a pamphlet without dragging me and my slaves into it. Yet had I never possessed one, it would not have affected the reasons brought forward on the subject. I have already given a satisfactory account (see Review, January 1786,) of these charges. But I shrink not from the question, in any of the malicious shapes in which it is intruded on the publick.

I will first suppose every charge to be as true, as in fact they are all false. It is only a particular instance of the truth of my general observation, that Europeans are apt to be carried away, even further than Creoles in their inattentive behaviour to slaves; and that slavery puts one man more in the power of another, than any ordinary degree of virtue or benevolence in the master can keep him from abusing. The truth is, on my first settlement abroad, I took slavery as I found it, contenting myself with endeavouring to make their lives comfortable, and to communicate to them the advantages

vantages of the gospel of Christ. It was not till after the task had been imposed on me, and my observing and thinking and writing on this subject had given me an extensive view of it, that I formed my present opinions respecting slavery, and its opposition to humanity, sound policy, and even present profit. This will account for the indulgence with which I treated the master in my original Essay, and which drew on me the censure of the M. Reviewers, though they have since changed their note. I could not condemn them generally, but on principles that must have included myself, and of my own sincerity I could not doubt. To return to your charges.

Perhaps my settlement among slaves, and their masters, was directed from on high, to bring this oppressive business before the publick. I am sure the accident, which first directed me towards it, was an event, that from my ordinary caution was less likely to have happened to me, than most men who have used a sea life. Be not alarmed, Mr. Tobin, I am not going to exalt myself. Very mean men, and, as you will add, very bad men, have been made important instances in the Divine economy. Even you, who oppose the relief of the slave, may be made to contribute essentially towards it.

With respect to severity, my slaves were only such in name. They could not be further advanced, without being made wholly free. This the state of the colony did not then favour. Freed slaves need a protector to defend them from insult; without one their situation is truly uneasy. It is with this view that the French Code Noir attaches freed slaves to the family to which they originally belonged, in the manner of the old Roman clients. There were no laws adapted to their new state, to which their conduct could be referred. Being chiefly Africans, they had no families with which

they could coalesce. Under my care they were properly fed and clothed. No hard work was imposed on them; they were not forced to keep unseasonable hours. They had leisure and opportunity for instruction. Their deficiency in the language checked my success. But I, in no view, lost my labour; and in no place have given my enemies room for thus repeatedly renewing the charge. They were brought on in knowledge, so as to be deemed worthy of baptism. All this was an advancement above thousands of their fellows. None were put under the power of a town free negroe or mulatto tradesman, as you are pleased *probably* to conjecture. Those who were guilty of theft were sent off the island; at that time only good slaves were in demand on it. Severe masters might perhaps correct the villainy, which I could not force myself to punish. At the worst, they could not suffer only for their criminal and ungrateful conduct. On my leaving the island, those, who were judged worthy of freedom, were manumitted. The rest were disposed of to masters of their own choice, or persons noted for their humanity, who, for an encouragement to receive them, were allowed to set their own value on them; and they were dismissed with new clothes and money. They were not sold with sang froid; the necessary disposal of them gave me more uneasiness, than every other circumstance attending my removal. I have ever declared myself against the indiscriminate freeing of slaves. I wish improvement and privilege to go hand in hand; and to look forward beyond all those who are now in being for the completion of it. One, who has been long habituated to slavery, if freed, must be placed in peculiar circumstances, be fixed in some employment, and become part of a family, in order to demean himself properly, and be happy in his new state. The laws must be his master,

master, and keep him to strict discipline. Among all the grown-up Jews, who had been slaves in Egypt, only two were thought worthy of inheriting in the land of Canaan. One woman, whom I hastily freed, though otherwise sensible, having no check on her conduct, has, I am told, turned out worthless and abandoned. If you be the son of the above Mr. Tobin, the history of some very near black or yellow relations of yours must have taught you the impropriety of unadvisedly setting favourites free. But all this is accounted for in the observations accompanying Capt. Smith's letter, and still allows us to look wishfully forward to the time, when liberty shall claim every sorrowing son of Africa for her liege subject.

P. 27. You excuse the planter's abuse of power by his critical situation, and unfortunate local and political necessity. Is not this the tyrant's constant plea for every act of cruelty and oppression?

P. 28. You justly applaud Mr. Gregory's Essays; but suppose him mistaken about the negroes knocked in the head at Jamaica.

Your notice of him is perhaps a return for his observation of my having been "answered by a spirited (but apparently interested) writer," meaning the C. Remarks, as I had once supposed. But I find he did not intend them; but a still-born pamphlet that preceded them. The master of this Guineaman, who is probably yet alive, told the story, within these five years, with this circumstance, that the negroes were trepanned in small numbers into the boat, and were one by one knocked in the head and tumbled into the water. It is yet to be seen how this piece of your generalship, by which you attempt to buy off, with a compliment, a powerful adversary, will answer your purpose.

P. 29. You say, "nineteen corrections in twenty, inflicted on negroes, are the disagreeable consequences of quarrels, thefts, felonies, &c." and p. 30, that "perhaps it will generally be found, that such negroes, as exhibit the truly odious marks of severe correction, have incurred them by the sentence of colonial magistrates." Now in my time, nineteen out of twenty corrections were for absence from or neglect of work, especially grass picking. So well acquainted was I with the police prevailing at that time, as to venture to affirm that, anno 1781, in St. Kitt's, there was not one slave who could shew lasting marks of a punishment inflicted by the sentence of a magistrate. Private vengeance, sharpened by spleen alone, is equal to these effects. If you refer it to Nevis, I can only answer, that colony was not then celebrated for the strictness of its police, and that I cannot suppose the fact in any degree, which may warrant its being thrown out as a general observation.

P. 32. You say, you never was in a Guinea yard, or bought slaves there. You know there are no negroe sales in Nevis, and few planters from it, for various reasons, attend the St. Kitt's sales; and that before 1779, (after which sales for some time, were not numerous) you in particular, had not many opportunities. Still I do not dispute your possessing of virtuous scruples, only that you take extraordinary methods to convince the publick of their existence.

Note, p. 33. You say a negro frequently complains of cold, but never of heat. You might have read this in my Essay. But how agrees this with your affirming them to be sufficiently clothed, or with the C. Remarks, p. 63. that the generality of negroes may be supposed to consider clothes as an incumbrance? And how again agrees this with (p. 61.) its being the proprietors and managers pride

pride to see their people well clothed? and again, p. 49. that English slaves are not so well clothed as French slaves? This same love of contradiction is a sad enemy to consistency; but all may be arranged in your next. You say, p. 61. that the testimony of travellers contradicts my observation of childrens growth being checked by their going naked. I am not sure that this is a thing within the observation of a transient traveller; but allow them to have affirmed it. I and others have made a different observation; and I think we can give a reason for it.

P. 33. You say "the situation of every slave, as to health, &c. are most minutely known to those, whose interest it is to see their wants supplied."—Interest properly understood would prevent every degree of bad conduct among men; still a great proportion of evil continues in the world.

P. 40. You commend the Apology for Negroe Slavery, "as a sensible pamphlet, containing some very just strictures on my inquiry." I gave myself the trouble of writing down remarks on it; but I found it so vague, absurd, and contradictory to itself, and so little to the purpose, that I judged it might be left to work its own way in the world. If you have read it through, a man of your penetration will have discovered, that in one particular it is like a scorpion; it has stung itself to death with its own tail. The second edition so confidently announced is the individual first edition, with only the first twelve, and the four last pages, reprinted with a squib at Mr. Clarkson, called an appendix. A common trick, you know, when a work does not sell; though a sad disgrace to those, whose cause it had agitated.

P. 41. You say negroes are allowed to plant cotton in Nevis. I venture to say, that anno 1781, the

the negroes whole crop of cotton there did not amount to twenty bags; perhaps not to ten.

P. 41. You say, a specifick allowance of clothing is prescribed in Jamaica. This allowance is annually a jacket and pair of breeches, or to women a petticoat. But what is this to the other colonies?

P. 42. 88. You say "some of the old islands are so subject to dry weather, that a law for planting provisions would be nearly useless." Anguilla is the driest spot in the W. Indies; yet whites and blacks there chiefly depend on island provisions. Every year brings about seasons for planting corn and nutritious roots, which are interrupted as seldom as in Europe by unfavourable weather.

P. 43. You quote the Jamaica Code Noir, as commanding masters to instruct their slaves, and promote their conversion and baptism. Long tells us this, and I shall not dispute his authority; yet I wish he had given us the words of the law, and that you had added his note on it, where he complains of its having had no effect, because it had no penalty annexed. Little indeed can be expected on this subject from Jamaica police, where many a single parish is nearly equal in extent to the Leeward island government; some being without a church, several without a minister. If the reader wishes to see a comment on the Jamaica Code Noir, I recommend to him the perusal of a late publication called West Indian Eclogues, for forming a just opinion of them. But let him be prepared for giving the tear of commiseration to suffering humanity.

P. 46. You set down from the same author what a negroe may gain from his Sunday labour in Jamaica, as if the master's generosity should have credit for it. But will a slave worked down in his
master's

master's field during the week, and even in that island forced to toil on Saturday afternoon for his own provisions, have spirits to task himself on Sunday? Do you not, p. 73. where a different point is to be driven, observe that slaves cannot be brought to work regularly on Sunday for themselves or for hire? Is it not natural for them, to seize eagerly every occasion of forgetting, but for a while, their miserable lot? Would you, if your's were the cause of truth, be obliged to dwell on the many contradictions with which your work abounds?

P. 48. You say, I acknowledge an act in St. Kitt's to punish the maiming of slaves. Why add you not, passed anno 1783, about the time when my Essay was sent to the press in London?

P. 55. You observe, if the murderer mentioned by me to have been sent off the island, had not been secreted, he would have received condign punishment.—Very probably; because on his conviction, the master of the murdered negroe, besides having just vengeance inflicted on him, would have claimed from the publick two-fifth parts of his valuation.

P. 57. You say, there is no acknowledgment in C. Remarks of slaves being kept fifteen hours *at work*; nor is there any such charge in my Reply. I say *under the lash*, that is, from about five o'clock in the morning, near to which time these Remarks must (p. 53.) allow it begins to dawn, (being in summer within half an hour of sun rise, in winter about an hour and a half) when an early riser may see them entering the field, and eight o'clock in the evening, when p. 55. they allow them to be dismissed. But supposing, with the Rejoinder, p. 57. that they work but ten hours, is there no account made of the time taken to assemble and get into
the

the field, of their straying two or three or four miles to collect their bundles of grass, and their waiting about the works an hour or more in the evening, till the overseer thinks fit to call the list? I repeat, that anno 1781, there were plantations, where, besides this ordinary labour, half the gang was kept alternately up all night in crop time to attend the mill. The time necessary to kindle their fires, and prepare their food in the evening, protracts their time of going to rest till eleven o'clock at night.

P. 65. You say, "you have seldom seen a pregnant woman put to hard labour." By this time your readers will be desirous of having your terms explained, and knowing what you mean by hard labour. In my time, they were put to the same work with other women.

P. 56. You charitably observe, that my loss of temper must have affected my memory, when I say the bell rings at four in the morning to call the slaves to work. And on the truth or falsehood of it, you propose, in very elegant terms, indeed, to divide the lie between us. I shall not here return the compliment. I believe there was not one plantation clock in Nevis, by which you might accurately ascertain the time. But I trust, every man, who knows himself to be honest, will believe me, solemnly asserting here, that I was near enough to hear, while I lay in bed, a plantation clock strike four, and the bell ring immediately after it.

P. 71. You say, I convey an insinuation disadvantageous to the honour or honesty of W. India merchants, in affirming that "the price of sugar depends on the planter's credit with his merchant." I affirm, I hardly ever heard of an involved planter's sugar selling well, compared with that of planters not in debt. But this may be explained, saving the
the

the factor's honour. The involved planter is so much in arrears with, and draws so many bills on, his merchant, that his sugars must be brought to a sale as fast as they arrive; nay, they have been engaged before the ship reached her moorings.

P. 86. You observe, "There are more circumstances than he" (meaning me) "seems willing to allow, in which we do not so materially disagree as he" (meaning me) "suspects." I find no material circumstance in which taken generally we disagree. You claim the honour of the C. Remarks. P. 5. "They hope the blessings of freedom will in due time be equally diffused over the face of the whole globe." P. 29, note. "Slaves of small proprietors, residing on their estates, are, from their inability, worst provided for." Now such make two-thirds of the proprietors of Nevis, and a very great proportion of every other colony. P. 146. They allow that some hints concerning the extension of police and privileges to slaves, suggested in my Essay "are highly deserving the serious consideration of the *colonian* legislative bodies, and well intitled to the attention of the individual proprietors of W. India possessions." In your Rejoinder, p. 33. you say, "you are sensibly hurt at being represented an avowed champion of slavery, and a vindicator of the indiscriminate oppression of slave-holders." "You declare yourself as much a general enemy to negroe slavery, and the unnatural traffic in them, as Mr. R." P. 24. You say, "neither the slavery of the W. India colonies, or the commerce of the human species are to be defended, except on political grounds, and the general practice of all the most enlightened nations." P. 27. You say, "perhaps instances of an abuse of power may be sufficiently authenticated," (among planters) and p. 31. "that instances of barbarity

barbarity in commanders of Guinea ships may be produced is undeniable."

P. 33, 34. You say "to take down such a gigantic mass of deformity as the system of slavery established in the European colonies of America by gradual efforts, and from the materials to erect a regular and permanent temple to liberty, would immortalize the genius who should complete so stupendous a work." P. 81. You say, "You have reason to think that planters, in general, would have no objection to their slaves being christened, and instructed in the rudiments of religion and morality." P. 82. By the very pleasant account you give of the state and effects of Christianity in Barbadoes and Antigua among the slaves, you allow of their capacity for receiving instruction, and the advantages resulting from it. P. 86. You say, "The general police in the West-India islands stands in need of revivification and amendment." Now these things properly followed out, would lead to every point for which I contend; and yet, though thus agreeing with me in principle, you have contended every point with me. Could the peculiarity of my manner so offend one with whom I happen to be thus perfectly agreed, as to warrant the treatment I have met with from him? Pray explain this to your readers.

P. 86. You justly observe that "slaves need an additional security against the occasional effects of wanton violence." But repenting of this concession, in a note, you confine it chiefly to the insults they are liable to from the lower classes of independent white men. In my time this was not the case in St. Kitt's, and I believe as little so in Nevis, where the three feet and an inch sticks were always ready to be laid over the head of an offending inferior. The fact is, men of any influence were
always

always more ready to vindicate the insolence of their slaves to poor white people, than to allow them to be abused by them. A little before I left the W. Indies, one of my slaves had her cottage wilfully set on fire, in the dead of night, by a slave of a neighbouring plantation, by which she lost her little property, with difficulty saving herself and her children. Though the proof was brought home to the culprit, his protector was too powerful for me to contend with, and he escaped unpunished.

P. 90. You say, I "undesignedly pay a compliment to your general urbanity, in supposing you to be obliged to consult a particular dictionary for abusive terms." Do you not, agreeably to your own phrase, "draw strong conclusions from weak premises?" Might not a copious vocabulary of that sort be collected from the Rejoinder, and those C. Remarks, which you claim? But a peacock cannot mend his screaming. This may be your natural language. Though obliged to defend myself against it, I ought not otherwise to be offended at it.

P. 91. You requote the C. Remarker's verification of all the injurious charges laid against me in the St. Kitt's libel; and you stand boldly forth in your own name as an Esquire and Privy Counsellor, and say, you "once more solemnly aver them to be the truth." Have you considered all which you here aver for truth? Could you maintain them before a court of justice, should I institute an action of damages for the unprovoked injury done me by a man with whom I never had any connection? Will you, as an honest man, (the gentleman is fairly out of the question) take on you to prove that I was a harsh surgeon, a cruel master, with whose name the slaves were to be terrified by threats
of

of being sold to me? Will you prove that I quitted my religion, that I was once a Presbyterian; that I preached my people out of church; that I imposed on the chest of Chatham, a hurt received after I quitted the king's service; that I was a corrupt magistrate; that I was ever grasping at sea chaplainships; that I hawked my livings about to every sea and land chaplain; that I was the cause of all the oppression exercised on the inhabitants of St. Eustatius; that I misrepresented the colony of St. Christopher to administration, and have injured its good name with government; and the thousand other unfounded assertions contained in that libel? As even in the opinion of the M. Reviewers, January 1786, you, if you be the author of the C. Remarks, were the original aggressor, and in your present performance, impudently (shall I say) repeat the charge; I demand of you, you are obliged by your claim to the character of gentleman, to prove all this and much more, before you can pretend to complain of improper treatment from me in return for it. Till you shall have done this, I shall leave to every candid feeling person to apply such epithets to him, who is capable of this conduct, as they shall deem suitable to his merits and real character.

P. 92. You say, you have not followed me through all the petulant cavils, &c. made against the C. Remarks. The following are some of those which you have passed by in silence. In contradiction to these remarks, I had affirmed, in my Reply, that slaves are not attached to the soil in St. Kitt's; that the picking of grass is a most cruel oppressive business; that slaves, at work in the field, have no shelter to run to in time of rain; that on few plantations, anno. 1781, did a negroe's weekly allowance amount to three pounds of grain or flour; that

that negroes are not in general decently clothed; that managers wives are useful on plantations; that before the late war, on many plantations, negroes did not cost their owners annually above 26s. 4d. that there is no general law to restrain a master's cruelty; that the C. Remarker's happy state of slaves agrees not with one among ten in the British colonies; that the state of the St. Vincent's Caribbs, and Jamaica Marons (see C. Smith's letter) offers no good reason against our attempting the improvement of our slaves; that on Sunday the slave labours for food to support himself at his master's work during the week; that French slaves, in general, are better treated, and in a more improved state than English slaves, &c. Some of these are not frivolous objections to be passed over. The reader will conclude them to be all firmly established against you; for he will say, you would not have found room to reprimand me for calling myself Vicar of Teston, and leave these unanswered, could you have disproved them. I insist it would have answered your purpose better to have discussed them, than thus to have taken up the greater part of your present work with a repetition of the vague low carping of the C. Remarks at my character, with which the subject in dispute is not connected. For it is not founded on my worth, but on truth; it is indeed her cause. In fact your clients, the slave-holders, have reason to complain, that your book aims more to vilify me, than to vindicate them; and that you have wholly abandoned their cause, to indulge your spleen in personal detraction.

P. 94. You speak of your intire neglect of sarcastic sneers, &c. Is not this Rejoinder the first place where James Tobin, the Privy-Counsellor, has thought fit to shew himself? Why blend his distinguished rank? Why sully the fair character

he assumes, p. 96. by mixing with anonymous libellers? But if, in treading the stage, he has stumbled on one of their caps, and finds that it fits him, and is determined to wear it, no body has a right to disturb him in the quiet possession. If he be innocent, he may then judge how that man must have felt, who, without meaning or having given any provocation, intending only the advancement of the cause of humanity, has by a cowardly set of anonymous libellers, and now at last more boldly by a man of his rank, been held up to his country in every horrid and hateful point of view, for having written a lukewarm book (see M. Review, July 1784, June 1785) on a subject, concerning which, it seems, after all, he and Mr. Tobin are in every great point agreed (see observation on Rejoinder, p. 86). If indeed you think humanely on the subject, why thus degrade yourself into the wretched apologist for capricious cruelty and niggardly pinching? Why labour to shew, that no alteration is necessary in the present situation of slaves? Why express such virulence against their advocate; when by bringing your rank, your character, p. 96, and your particular knowledge of the subject to their aid, you can plead most powerfully on their side, and silence every opponent? Do this in a liberal manly way; and then, if it will do your heart good, go on as you already have, to cut and mangle my reputation, till hatred and malice say, It is enough. Blend not my character with my reasoning, and I think I can promise you not to reply.

I have now gone through whatever appeared to me worthy of notice, in your Rejoinder, and I shall leave the publick to determine how far "it has been your sincere desire and intention," p. 115. to inform and not to mislead the public. To me
the

the Rejoinder appears intended for interested or indolent readers, men, who wish to take your word without examining the truth of your assertions. The great aim of your pamphlet is not indeed to defend slavery, for p. 86, &c. you have abandoned all the outworks and defences thereof; but its aim is to hold me up as an object of publick detestation, as a turbulent unprincipled innovator. You will not leave your readers to form their own judgments of me and my writings, or to deduce their own conclusions; but you constantly mention both, by the lowest and most opprobrious distinctions, by epithets, which even, if deserved, sound harsh in a gentleman's lips. If vile, or worthless, as you describe them, both will discover their own naughtiness; it is not necessary for you, a fine gentleman, to keep continually raking in such filth. I am happy in having been able to confine my animadversions, respecting my new acquaintance James Tobin, to the work before me. It will not hurt you to make a candid apology, and follow my example.

In short, Sir, stick to your proper business; I really long to return to mine. The subject of slavery is too rotten for all your skill, assisted either by the corrections of a learned friend, or the borrowed labour of an hireling, at this advanced period of the discussion, so to varnish it, as to bear handling. Give it up, and suffer things to take that course towards humanity and good sense, to which at present they tend. — But I recall this advice. — Go on to combat. Truth acquires additional lustre from every new attack. Providence brings good out of evil. By acting the tyrant's advocate, you prove the negroe's friend. May heaven speedily accomplish the wishes of humanity respecting them!

J. R.

A P P E N D I X.

I SHALL take this opportunity of laying before the publick the method of making sugar in the East-Indies by freemen; which allows the commodity to be brought to market in Batavia at 9s. 4½d. per 100 lb. some times at 7s. 6d. while sugar made in our colonies by slaves cannot advantageously for the planter be sold for less than about 24s. per 100 lb. on the spot. The freight, taxes, waste, and other expences add full 20s. more before it can be sold in Britain. The account was taken from a gentleman, who superintended a sugar plantation in the East-Indies, and who is well acquainted both with the French and English colonies in the W. Indies; and who expresses his astonishment, that a comparison should be drawn between the English and French treatment of slaves; so much better is the state of these last.

The proprietor of the land erects a mill and works for manufacturing the sugar, and lets it out to farm. The farmer subdivides the farm to others, who till, plant, and weed the canes, with the assistance of free labourers, and are allowed so much per pekul (which weighs 133⅓ lb.) on the sugar made from it, the melasses being thrown into the bargain. The head farmer hires people to cut and grind the canes, and manufacture the sugar; all being paid a certain rate per pekul of the sugar made. The labourers are freemen who generally have other trades, and consider sugar-making as a harvest employment. The best kind of clayed sugar sells at Batavia for 12s. 6d. per pekul. The sugar is made from a vast variety of canes that grow on different soils; the age of the canes, when

when cut, is from 12 to 14 months. The whole expence of the plantation ceases with the making of sugar. No slaves or servants are retained; and the free labourers do not exceed above one-tenth of the number of slaves, that would be judged necessary for the same work in the W. Indies.

One ploughing is judged sufficient. One Chinese man and his buffalo, plough an acre in three mornings and evenings, resting in the heat of the day. The ground is harrowed, and opened into drills about three feet distance, as if for planting of beans. The cane tops are planted at a foot distance. When they grow up to need earthing, the top of the plant is twisted to be out of the way of the work. The buffaloe and his master are sent in, and a furrow is cast up against each row on each side, they going both up and down between each two rows. Two men afterwards go in with an iron shovel, shaped like a shovel for filling hop bags, but indented for entering the ground. A rope is fixed to it by two holes made in the body of it, which is passed over a stick or swivel. One man directs the handle, the other pulls on the swivel standing on the opposite side of the row. The plants are earthed up in the manner of the celery plants, but much higher, especially in wet grounds. The shovel is used first on one side, then on the other of each row.

The cane juice is lightly tempered with quicklime, or lime water, and boiled in large coppers with the magoss or dried cane. Two coppers contain as much as five ordinary W. Indian coppers. Each copper has a fire; but this gentleman hung five coppers to one fire, making them one continued surface. When brought to the consistence of a thin syrup, the two coppers are emptied into a large vat standing between them, supplied with cocks at different heights. While the syrup is hot,
about

about ten gallons of water is thrown on the top of the vat. After the syrup has stood six or eight hours, it is drawn off by the cocks in succession, new tempered, boiled down, and struck into moulds. The syrup in the moulds is well agitated immediately on being poured in, and again when beginning to granulate. The refuse of the clayed sugar is boiled up a second time into an inferior sort.

The gentleman is positive that the labour of one free man, in this manufacture, is equal to that of ten slaves on a sugar plantation in the W. Indies.

The following extract from the history of ancient Mexico, as lately published by C. Cullen, will exhibit an attention to the rights of humanity, that may well put European barbarity to shame, while it affords hints for the first necessary improvements in the condition of our slaves, if not too proud to be taught by people, whom we have long esteemed savage and inhuman.

V. I. P. 359. " Among the ancient Mexicans there were three sorts of slaves. The first were prisoners of war; the second, slaves purchased for a valuable consideration; the third, malefactors deprived of their liberty for their crimes.

The prisoners of war were generally sacrificed to their gods. He who in war took another's prisoner from him, or set him at liberty, was punished with death.

The sale of a slave was not valid, unless it was made in the presence of four lawful witnesses. In general they assembled in greater numbers, and celebrated contracts of that nature with great solemnity.

Among the Mexicans a slave was allowed to have cattle, to acquire property, and even to purchase slaves who served him; nor could his owner hinder him, nor have service from such slaves; for
slavery

slavery was only an obligation of personal service, and even that was under certain restrictions. Nor was slavery entailed upon the descendants of slaves. All Mexicans were born free, although their mothers were slaves. If a free man impregnated another person's slave, and she died during her pregnancy, he became the slave of the owner of the female slave; but if she was happily delivered, the child as well as the father remained both free.

Necessitous parents were allowed to dispose of any one of their children, in order to relieve their poverty; and any free man might sell himself for the same purpose; but owners could not sell their slaves without their consent, unless they were slaves with a collar. Runaway, rebellious, or vicious slaves had two or three warnings given them by their owners, which warnings they gave for their better justification in presence of some witnesses. If in spite of these admonitions the slaves did not mend their behaviour, a wooden collar was put about their necks, and then it was lawful to sell them at market. If after having been owned by two or three masters, they still continued intractable, they were sold for the sacrifices, but that happened very rarely. If a slave, who was collared in this manner, happened to escape from the prison where his owner confined him, and took a refuge in the royal palace, he remained free; and the person who attempted to prevent his gaining this asylum, forfeited his liberty for the attempt, except it was the owner, or one of his children who had a right to seize him.

The persons who sold themselves were generally gamesters, who did so in order to game with the price of their liberty, or those who by laziness, or some misfortune, found themselves reduced to misery, and prostitutes who wanted clothes to make their appearance in publick; for women of that class

class among the Mexicans had no interest in general in their profession, but the gratification of their passions. Slavery amongst the Mexicans was not so hard to be borne as it was among other people, for the condition of a slave among them was by no means oppressive. Their labour was moderate, and their treatment humane; when their masters died, they generally became free. The common price of a slave was a load of cotton garments.

There was among the Mexicans another kind of slavery, which they call Huehuetatlocolli; which was, where one or two families, on account of their poverty, bound themselves to furnish some lord perpetually with a slave. They delivered up one of their sons for this purpose, and after he had served some years they recalled him, in order to let him marry, or for some other motive, and substituted another in his place. The change was made without giving any offence to the patron; on the contrary he generally gave some consideration for a new slave. In the year-1506, on account of a great scarcity which happened then, many families were obliged to this kind of servitude, but they were all freed from it by the king of Acolhuacan, Nezahualpilli, owing to the hardships they suffered from it; and after his example the same thing was done by Montezuma the second, in his dominions." Quere. What is this but a pious child helping to maintain his parents by his labour?